UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,170	06/29/2001	Snehanshu Shah	HiVE 1100-1	7429

26668	7590	05/13/2005		

LOGICVISION (CANADA), INC.
1565 CARLING AVENUE, SUITE 508
OTTAWA, ON K1Z 8R1
CANADA

EXAMINER
BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/896,170	SHAH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 October 2004*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 June 2001* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendment received 10/12/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Burdick et al. (hereinafter Burdick, U.S. Patent No. 6,148,307) in view of Rangan et al.

(hereinafter Rangan, U.S. Patent No. 6,802,042).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claim 9), <u>Burdick</u>

teaches *gathering raw data from diverse sources* and *translating said raw data into a*

user specified format in that raw data (101) is generated at or within a particular plant

facility (Col. 4, lines 19-20). Raw data can come from data generated from each process

step or group of steps (Col. 4, lines 29-30). Raw data may be in one of a number of

formats (Col. 4, lines 44-54). A reformatter server (102) is provided to reformat raw data

(101) into a standardized data format known as Data Input Standard or DIS (Col. 4,

lines 55-58). The raw data from diverse sources is fed into the reformatter server, which

in a sense *gathers* it for translating. <u>Burdick</u> does not teach that the *translation format is*

user specified. However, <u>Rangan</u> teaches that raw result data is prepared according to

user-requested presentation options in such as GUI module 181 of Fig. 8. Here, raw

data is translated so as to appear in different forms to the user (Col. 23, lines 41-48). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

combine the teachings of Burdick and Rangan as both inventions relate to accumulating

varied information for presentation to a user in a form that the end-user can interpret.

Adding the teaching of Rangan provides the benefit of manual control over the

translation (formatting) process.

Burdick continues by teaching *loading said translated raw data into an*

application server in that once raw data (101) has been reformatted into DIS data (103)

by the reformatter server (102), the DIS data is loaded, via loader (104) into local

database server (105) to produce database (106) (Col. 5, lines 39-41).

Burdick does not specifically teach *summarizing and indexing said translated raw*

data. However, Rangan teaches an Internet portal system for gathering raw data from

Internet sites and presenting meta-summarized information from the data to a

requesting user via a report algorithm selected by the user. The report algorithm then

summarizes the raw data and generates a report (Col. 3, lines 29-49). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the

teachings of Burdick and Rangan as both inventions relate to accumulating varied

information for presentation to a user in a form that the end-user can interpret. Adding

the teaching of Rangan provides the benefit of manual control over the translation

(formatting) process.

Rangan also teaches *receiving a user specified request for data* in that a report

processor receives a report request made according to an individual one of a plurality of

pre-defined user requests, by a report processor at an Internet-connected portal system

from a user (see (a) bullet, Claim 8).

Rangan also teaches *relating said requested data to said translated raw data via*

said summarized and indexed translated raw data in that a request processor receives

a request and matches the request to one of the reporting algorithms, which in turn,

gathers data related to the request and processes it (*retrieving said translated raw data*

relating to said requested data) (Col. 3, lines 39-47). A report is then generated and the

portal system transmits it to the requestor of the data (*providing said translated raw data*

relating to said requested data to said user via a user interface) (Col. 3, lines 47-49). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

combine the teachings of Burdick and Rangan as both inventions relate to accumulating

varied information for presentation to a user in a form that the end-user can interpret.

Adding the teaching of Rangan provides the benefit of presenting potentially diverse

data in a consolidated manner.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claim 10), Burdick

teaches *analyzing said translated raw data relating to said requested data; and*

visualizing said translated raw data relating to said requested data in that a GUI

provides the client with a variety of options with regard to the format of retrieved data

from a complex search request. The GUI may allow the client to view or browse the

produced data, or may reformat that data into one of a number of formats corresponding

to commercially available database programs (e.g., Lotus 1-2-3®, Paradox®, Excel®,

RS1®, SAS®, or the like). Thus, engineers within a particular production facility or

department may download information from database (106) and reformat this

information into other database programs to meet pre-existing program or project needs

(Col. 7, lines 65-67; Col. 8, lines 1-9). Note that any actions which produce reports,

graphs, tables (i.e., reduced output) are in fact summarizing the translated raw data

because

In regard to dependent Claims 3-4 (and similarly dependent Claims 11-12),

Burdick fails to teach that *said user interface is a web browser coupled to said*

application server via a network connection. However, Rangan teaches a Browser

Interface (69) connected to a portal Interface (153) via an Internet connection (161) (see

Fig. 4, items 69, 71; Fig. 7).

Rangan also teaches that *said network connection is an Internet connection* (see

Fig. 1; Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the teachings of Burdick and Rangan as both inventions relate to

accumulating varied information for presentation to a user in a form that the end-user

can interpret. Adding the teaching of Rangan provides the benefit of accessing data

over the Internet using a convenient interface.

In regard to dependent Claims 5-6 (and similarly dependent Claims 13-14),

Burdick fails to explicitly teach that *said application server is coupled to said*

diverse data sources via a network connection. However, Rangan teaches a portal

interface connected to diverse Internet sites containing data (see Fig. 7, items 151, 139, 147, 149). Rangan also teaches that *said network connection is an Internet connection* (Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Burdick and Rangan as both inventions relate to accumulating varied information for presentation to a user in a form that the end-user can interpret. Adding the teaching of Rangan provides the benefit of accessing data over the Internet.

In regard to dependent Claims 7-8 and dependent Claims 15-16, Burdick teaches *storing said translated raw data in a data management system* and that the *data management system comprises databases* in that once raw data (101) has been reformatted into DIS data (103) by reformatter server (102), the DIS data is loaded, via loader (104) into local database server (105) to produce database (106) (Col. 5, lines 39-41).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
05/05/05

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER